

14th March 1928]

## Forests

*Control of the Narasingapuram forest in the Gundamanikanur zamindari.*

1748-Q.—Mr. L. K. TULASIRAM: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state with reference to the answer to question No. 1368 answered on 24th January 1928—

(a) whether the Narasingapuram forest in the Gundamanikanur zamindari and its branches, viz., the Varisanadu forest and the Kadamalakundu forest in the Madura district are at the disposal of Government;

(b) if so, when and how the Government assumed control of the said forest and its branches;

(c) whether M.R.Ry. M. S. Sessa Ayyangar Avargal, M.L.A., has, as wakil on behalf of the ryots of Narasingapuram, presented a petition to the Collector of Madura in connexion with the action proposed to be taken under section 26 of the Forest Act;

(d) whether it is a fact that the District Collector and the Conservator of Forests, V Circle, visited the said forest between 18th and 22nd January 1928;

(e) if so, for what purpose and with what object; and

(f) whether the Government are now aware of any of the proposals mentioned in (e) to (g) of my question referred to above?

A.—(a) & (b) The forest referred to is not at the disposal of Government.

(c) Yes.

(d) & (e) The forest was inspected by the Collector and the Conservator in connexion with an application to them by the owner to extend the provisions of section 26 of the Madras Forest Act.

(f) There is no proposal to apply section 29 of the Forest Act.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (\*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

## II

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION OF AN EX-MINISTER.

\* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, with your permission I beg to offer a word of personal explanation with reference to what was said of me by the hon. Minister yesterday. He stated that I did not answer the question why my hon. Friend Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar and myself met some of the leaders of the Congress party . . ."

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"Sir, I wish to know whether the hon. Member can make a statement in addition to what he made yesterday. I would only ask you to consider whether it is permissible that he should continue from day to day making statements of this nature. It will lead to a debate. The rules, I would submit, contemplate only one statement and one reply."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The point of order raised is that it may give room to the continuance of the debate."

[14th March 1928]

\* **MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR** :—"You will remember, Sir, that I was absolutely impersonal yesterday; I do not propose to do anything otherwise to-day."

\* **The hon. the PRESIDENT** :—"The hon. Member has taken my consent on the ground that the hon. Minister made an attack upon his conduct in connexion with the no-confidence motion tabled by the Congress Party. If the object of the hon. Member is really to explain to the House his conduct, I think he will be in order and I have simply to refer to one passage. 'The House in all cases of personal explanation will frequently waive a rigid adherence to established usage especially when the public conduct of a member is involved'."

**The RAJA OF RAMNAD** :—"May I know the name of the book, Sir."

\* **The hon. the PRESIDENT** :—"Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure. As I think that the conduct of the hon. Member is involved in the statement made by the hon. the Chief Minister, he will be in order to make a statement with reference to the attack on his conduct."

11-15  
a.m.

\* **MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR** :—"I have already said that with me, the question of refusing to tender evidence before the Statutory Commission is an All-India one . . ."

\* **The hon. the PRESIDENT** :—"Order, order. I have given permission to the hon. Member to give a personal explanation with regard to the attack made on his conduct by the Chief Minister with reference to his alleged connexion with the no-confidence motion."

\* **MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR** :—"I obey your ruling, Sir. He stated, Sir, that I was a party to the motion of no-confidence against him. My Colleague, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, has already told the House that we endeavoured our best to persuade our friends to drop the idea of no-confidence motion. Many Members on this side cannot be unaware of my efforts on the 1st instant calculated to achieve the same object. Why, Sir, even an hour before the Council met on the 2nd instant, I was telling my friends that, even if 42 people stood up for the motion, I considered it my duty to have the motion defeated in the form in which it was couched. Then I had not the ghost of an idea that, by any stretch of imagination, the results of the motion as it was framed could be associated with the earlier resolution of the Legislative Council. I shall not say anything more, Sir, at least for the present."

\* **The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN** :—"Mr. President, Sir, I want to make a personal explanation and it is this. I will content myself with reading two passages, one from a letter of the Leader of the Swarajya Party to the Press and another by the Deputy Leader of the Swarajya Party to the Press."

\* **MR. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN** :—"Sir, I raise the same point as was raised by the hon. the Leader of the House. The hon. the Minister raises a question which was not raised in this House but was raised outside this House. I do not think the hon. the Minister can be allowed to give an explanation with regard to matters which were raised outside this House."

14th March 1928]

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Sir, I made that statement in view of the statement made by the Leader of the Swarajya Party in the Press. I think I ought to be allowed to touch on that considering that you allowed my hon. Friend to give an explanation."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"With regard to the permission I have given to Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, it is to give him an opportunity to vindicate his conduct before the House, but here the hon. the Chief Minister wants to give the reasons why he made a particular statement. I do not think the reasons would constitute any element of personal explanation. There may have been various elements which might have induced the Chief Minister to make a particular statement. But the reason for the same cannot constitute any personal explanation."

### III

#### COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

1. The Secretary laid on the table copies of—

(i) a G.O. No. 199, Development, dated 3rd February 1928, recording the audit report of the Government Industrial Institute, Madura, for 1926-27.

(ii) a G.O. No. 207, Development, dated 6th February 1928, recording the audit report of the Government Institute, Madura, for the quarter ending 30th June 1927.

2. With reference to the answer to supplementary question to question No. 1448 given at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 25th January 1928, the Secretary laid on the table copies b of the original question regarding the appointment of Oriyas in the Civil Court of Ganjam district and the answer thereto.

### IV

#### MOTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR 1928-29.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Under sub-rule (2) of rule 29 of the Madras Legislative Council Rules, His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to fix one day as the maximum for the discussion of the motions on each of the following demands, viz., Land Revenue Demand I; Education (Transferred) Demand XIX and Civil Works (Transferred) Demand XXX; and half a day as the maximum for motions affecting each of the other demands. I propose to treat the parts of a day before and after lunch as half a day each.

"Hon. Members will kindly remember that under rule 29 (3) it will be my duty at 5 p.m. on the 30th March to put every question necessary to dispose of all outstanding matters in connexion with the Demands for Grants."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, I would like to know what the time limit, if any, is."